This is lecture ten—The Emergence of Medieval Christianity. Greetings once again in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and let me invite you to join me in prayer as we start our class again today. Let us pray. Eternal God, we recognize that as we approach our study for today, we come from various conditions and circumstances that our minds are filled with many things. We ask that you would free us from those kinds of concerns and cares which would impede our understanding of your work and Word in the world and give us guidance by your Spirit that we would learn what you would have us to learn so that we can serve you better. For it’s in Christ’s name we pray. Amen.

A period of approximately 1000 years between 500 and 1500 AD, between the sixth and sixteenth centuries, is generally recognized as the Middle Ages; in the history of the church this period is often called the period of Medieval Christianity. Such terms, of course—Middle Ages and Medieval—carry more than the usual amount of connotation or association. For some the terms have romantic associations of the time of knights in shining armor, of lordly princes, imposing castles, and perhaps even surfs filling rocky soil. For others the terms have become synonymous with the Dark Ages, that which is archaic, irrelevant, and impractical. As one person phrased it, “A thousand years without a bat.” For nearly everyone, the period seems to be marked by certain central characteristics. These form a kind of Medieval mythology. For example many tend to see Medieval society as static or monolithic, something which has remained largely unchanged for a 1000 years. Ordinary folk, it’s thought, believed and lived almost exactly the same in 1400 as they had in 600.

Most also tend to see this time as an age of faith, or at least and age of the church with the institutional church dominating the life of society. Crafts people, merchants, serfs, kings all under control of clergy and church and dominated by them. Many others tend to see this as a time when future orientation predominated. The
suggestion is made that life was so miserable that the average lay person had no choice but to take refuge in the hope of future bliss, looking forward to better things in heaven because life on earth was so difficult.

Well, these three assumptions along with many others are basically false. They are myths, in fact, propagated by the Renaissance Humanists of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The Renaissance, of course, was a period of rebirth or renewal of culture and this involved some leading figures such as Petrarch, who's often seen as the first great humanist in the fourteenth century; or Lorenzo Valla or John Colee (sp?) or Roiclin (sp?) or Moore or Rasmus or a many number of others. Wishing to return to the pristine purity of classic Greek and Roman culture, those areas that we just looked at, they identified this intervening millennium as a time of static traditionalism, unrefined in its barbarity and unhappiness.

These Renaissance people, in fact, were those folk who made these years the Dark Ages, a rendering of which has been calculated to exhibit by contrast the kind of brightness of classical and in fact neoclassical culture which they were trying to revive. In actuality, Medieval society was anything but static and monolithic. In fact, it was a very dynamic and rapidly changing period of history in constant flux. Nor can it be said that it was dominated by the church and the clergy. In fact, it often seems as if it was more dominated traditionally by princes and others, particularly local leaders. Furthermore, the Medieval church was no more future oriented than ours is today. All ages tend to feel the tension between what is already and what is not yet. That which we know is reality now and that which we look forward to as a part of our hope for the future.

How, in fact, can one consider a static and barbaric and backward or monolithic any age produced people like Thomas Aquinas or Donte, or which produced the university or parliament or those magnificent cathedrals which many of you have seen—Chartres, Notre Dame, other great cathedrals of Europe and of England which emerged out of this very time. In short, as Paul Oskar Kristeller and others have been teaching us now for several decades, the Middle Ages are times of great excitement, change, and variety. This is true for the church, as well as for the larger community. And I’d like for us in the coming classes to reflect some of that vitality and change, some of that interesting substance which is often been veiled in darkness, and I’m not alone in wishing to do
so, for in recent years courses in Medieval history and culture are among the most fully subscribed courses in universities across our country and around the world. In fact, the Middle Ages in a kind of ironic twist have been experiencing a sort to renaissance of their own, and we’re fortunate to have some wonderful resources available for this study.

Those of you who are following along in our Louterette text will want to look at pages 269 to 277 in particular, but others of you may want to find in the libraries or in your booksellers books like R. W. Southern’s *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages*. This is a well-known and often read book, a part of the Pelican History of the Church series, which you can find in paperback. Others of you may want to look at specialized studies such as F. L. Ganshof’s particular study of *Feudalism* published by Harper and Row in 1961 or Deno Geanakoplos’ *Byzantine East and Latin West* published by Harper in 1966. Or you may want to look at general works like William Cannon’s *History of Christianity in the Middle Ages* which Abingdon published or Karl Volz’s *The Church of the Middle Ages* published by Concordia. Or perhaps a set of documents from this period like Marshall Baldwin’s fine collection, *Christianity through the 13th Century* published by Harper and Row. Or Ernest Henderson’s *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages* published in London by Bell and Sons. Those of you who have a particular interest in maps may want to dig out Collin McEvedy, *The Penguin Atlas of Medieval History*, which is in paperback and which offers some wonderful maps.

These and many other resources are available and I’ll be mentioning some of those as we move through our classes together, but these are good places to begin. Indeed, most scholars contend now that Western civilization was born in fact in the Middle Ages. Western civilization is that which stood alongside of the two other great civilizations which emerged at this time—Byzantine civilization, which we’ll talk about in a later lecture, and Islamic culture and civilization, which we will look at in a later lecture.

Medieval civilization itself rose in a sense from a synthesis of three great cultural traditions—the Greco-Roman, which we’ve had a chance to look at already, the Judeo-Christian, which we’ve looked at already, and the Germanic. Let’s take a moment just to look at the Germanic culture together. Before we do that, however, I’d like to say just a word about the rise of Medieval culture as a whole.
This corresponded with a decline as many of you are aware of the Roman civilization and the Roman Empire. Gibbon in his famous *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* targets a variety of reasons for the fall of Rome after its great history, itself being a kind of cradle for the early development of the Christian church, and among those elements he lists such things as the great burden of taxes, which are increasing, the rise of inflation throughout the empire, cultural disorientation, unequal distribution of wealth between the rich and the poor, relaxation of discipline, the gradual erosion of freedom, virtue, and honor, all of those things which we are so aware of in our study of Roman decline.

We could also add to this such things as soil exhaustion, slavery and its impact, disease, and as some have suggested, the rise of Christianity itself. In fact, those of you who are familiar with St. Augustine’s *City of God* will remember that he in part is writing that as a counterattack to those who are saying that Rome fell as a result of Christianity’s rise, and Gibbon, of course, picks up this theme as well. None of these elements is adequate in itself for explaining the fall of the great Roman civilization, but we do know that out of the ashes of that fall came both the Byzantine Empire in the East and also the new forms of structure and culture and society in the West. The West, you see, suffered both from political breakdown, the collapse which is often dated around 476 AD as a kind of convenient in point for a process that had been going on in the collapse of Rome for some years, but also a great cultural transformation. The third century which struggled with issues of anarchy; the fourth century with problems of totalitarianism and the fifth century witnessing the kind of final collapse of Rome. All of these form the kind of foundation out of which emerges the unique Western Medieval civilization which will be looking at in more detail over the coming weeks.

Perhaps the most significant reason for the breakdown was the slowdown of imperial expansion itself. The deurbanization process saw the aristocracy fleeing the cities and setting up their lives in rural areas with agriculture as the economic base. This was the foundation of the feudal establishment, which I’d like for us to think about a little in just a moment.

With that background then let’s come briefly at least to the Germanic influence. We talked a little bit about the three great ingredients, the cultural traditions which helped to make up Medieval civilization, the Greco-Rome, the Judeo-Christian, and the Germanic, and the third of these is probably the least familiar
to us. Germanic culture began to influence the empire during the last years of its administration. Germanic culture dominated the political and military organization of what our called the Barbarian State. Now when we hear about the Barbarians, we tend to see folk who look very different from ourselves. We see people with whom we would have no association and, in fact, a rather wild-eyed rabble-rouser, and indeed some perhaps were. But by and large these were folk just like we are, carrying their own cultures, their own interests, their own passions, their own needs and struggles, and suffering with them.

It is among this group, however, these Barbarian States that we have the beginnings along with the older traditions of the great Medieval Western structure. These invaders, these Barbarian invaders, so called generally became nominal Christians, usually of a heretical sort, often Arians or otherwise. But they brought their own unique elements of culture into this synthesis, which we know of as Medieval life and faith. Most of the invaders came originally from the Scandinavian areas. They migrated to Eastern and Southeastern Europe. The German invaders included folk like the Visigoths, Ostrogoths, and the Vandals. Some of you may have a faint recollection from other studies of these interesting mobile, ruthless folk who entered the empire, often considered crude, but bringing with them we need to remind ourselves the principle of government under law. There's no absolute royal authority. In fact, some have even suggested that democracy had its genesis in these forests of Germany under the so-called Barbarians.

The first major invasion was by the fierce Asian horsemen, the Huns. They conquered one Germanic tribe after another, captured the Ostrogoths, the Visigoths fled for sanctuary behind the Roman Danube Frontier and there the Visigoths were badly treated, went on a rampage led by Alaric. The Vandals swept across Rhine into Gaul. Anglo-Saxons and Jutes invade Britain. Visigoths then plundered Rome for three days in 410 AD. Then as some of you will remember, the Visigoths established a kingdom in Gaul in Spain, a kingdom which endured right down to the time of the Islamic Conquest in the eighth century. The Vandals took over North Africa with their kingdom centered in Carthage. They became the great pirates of the Mediterranean.

In the fifth century, the Huns led by Attila plundered Italy. They finally faced Leo I at the very gates of Rome, and some of you may be familiar with the great picture by Raphael of this event of Attila facing Leo I at the very gates of Rome and being turned back by
the Pope. Attila died, of course, and the Huns Empire collapse, never to rise again.

After 476, the Ostrogoths, now free of the Huns, established a strong state in Italy led by Theoderic whose administration ran from 493-526. Boethius in his famous *Consolation of Philosophy* was an official under Theoderic and some of you will remember his writing. This was a relatively stable period. Meanwhile, Clovis, whose name was later softened to Louis, established a Frankish kingdom in Gaul. He was by the way also a Barbarian, so called. Clovis, however, had become a Christian and was viewed in some circles kind of like a Constantine. Thus by AD 500, the situation is as follows: Theoderic, the Ostrogothic Arian regime had established itself in Italy, Clovis had established himself in France, the Vandals, having turned to Arian Christianity were established in North Africa, the Visigoths, Arian also in Christianity, had established themselves in Spain and Southern France, and the Anglos and Saxons had established themselves in England.

Now we need to remind ourselves also that though this was the condition in the West, what is called Byzantium or Eastern empire life endured. In fact, the Roman Empire in the East never did actually fall. The East was always more populous than the West, the cities were larger, the civilizations were older, commercial and industrial centers were stronger, and the very heart of this empire was Constantinople. These are the folk who repelled the Persian Siege in the seventh century and the Islamic attack in the eighth century. Generally well governed, the Byzantium presented a kind of rich culture and government, which was a mixture of the old Roman government of Christian religion and of the Greco-Oriental cultures.

The Christian church was torn by theological debates in the fifth and sixth centuries and many of these in their forms of discussion and decision took place in the East in a much more stable part of the empire. Now we’re going to take a look at this great Byzantine Empire in a later lecture when we look at Eastern Christianity, and we need to recognize that that is continuing on even at the very time that we are looking at the West, its disintegration and its movement toward an increasingly futile system. Now remember, we’ll be coming back then to the Eastern church and to Byzantia as a kind of separate story, and we need to always keep that in the back of our minds even as we look at the West which is the focus of so-called fallen Rome in the establishment of a whole new kind of cultural pattern.
This was built in large measure around feudalism. Now feudalism developed as a result of certain adverse conditions—a weakened central government, limited commerce, invasions from outside. Feudalism itself implied and in fact required decentralization. Life became in the West localized. Violence was very common. The private sector seemed to take over from public authority. In short, we don’t have strong central governments existing except from time-to-time. What we have is life in a rural, agricultural, feudal structure.

Now if we look at the church at that period, we see some interesting patterns emerging from that. Central among church life figures is the simple parish priest. The parish, of course, was the smallest unit of ecclesiastical establishment. It was in effect the area served by a priest or by a minister. Most of these were rural. They differed in size and function, depending on where you found them, and this system of rural parishes established early in the Middle Ages allowed for the endowment of property for the support of the parish. A tithe was expected from the local population. At first this was voluntary, but when not enough came in, it gradually became compulsory. The extent to which church property became feudalized varied greatly, but on average one might say that the priest administered the sacraments, he allocated part of the revenues to the poor, he sometimes instructed children, but that very role gave the priest and enormous leverage and power within these local areas.

Usually the parish priest had very limited education. The problem of clerical shortcomings is a major problem which emerges in the Middle Ages. Those who aren’t properly trained weren’t properly equipped for the great ministry which they had among the people. We see that in the decrees of the Ecclesiastical Council, which are loaded with both discussions of and decisions relating to how to handle these parish priests which oftentimes are not functioning as fully or as well as they ought to. Many times a group of priests lived together in certain areas in common life—semi-Monastic in their orientation. A parish priest is perhaps in the Middle Ages our best example of the union of spiritual and temporal. The parish was, of course, a piece of property. It was real estate. The church was a simple structure usually of wood, sometimes stone, though that became more popular in the late Middle Ages. The revenues were taken through tithes, money, or in kind there were contributions made for the sacraments, and often the money was used for church repairs, liturgical celebrations, the care of poor, and to pay the priest, of course, in their assistance.
The tithe tended to be divided into four parts. One part of the tithe went to the poor, and remember the importance that was placed from the very earliest years of the church on ministering to the needy, to the poor, and to those who were destitute. One part went to the church for its upkeep of the buildings and grounds and the like. One part went to the bishop and that was for the care not only of the bishop personally, but for the bishops care of the needy in the larger area, and one part went to the priest to buy food and to care for the practical needs of that ministry.

This four-part division is one that we see again and again throughout the Middle Ages and it’s a very interesting one in terms of its potential implications even for our day. The parish was, of course, a part of the feudal lord’s domain, and until feudalism, there was a kind of localism which focused around the lord or the major figure in a particular geographical area, and there was a relationship between the feudal lord and the serfs so called, those that were under that protection and authority. The serfs were to produce some of their crops, a part of their earnings for the lord’s use and the feudal lord was to provide protection and help to the serfs. It was a mutually beneficial, mutually interrelated kind of structure.

At times, however, the parish, which was often co-extensive with this feudal structure, became virtue thieves of the lord; that is, with the powerful lords overseeing these feudal structures. Oftentimes the priest, who was theoretically subject to the bishop, was actually subject to this political leader, the feudal lord. This caused enormous problems, and we read about that in much of the literature and debate of the councils and of the synod meetings. Some of these feudal lords even took over control of the tithe, so that they controlled even the money that was coming in for the church and its use.

This was the normal structure out in the countryside. There were, of course, some towns. There weren’t many towns and they weren’t very large, but in the towns groups of priests generally lived together in what were called collegia. A large church in these areas was called then a collegiate church, and we pick up that language even to our day where we have some collegiate churches of this sort. The church of a bishop was called a cathedral church, and priests in these churches were known as canons. Some cathedrals had as many as sixty or seventy canons. Most of them, however, were much smaller. The canons were the ones who elected the bishop, and the bishop in turn provided for the maintenance of
the canons under their control. As you see, the basic structure that is emerging is a very local one; it's a mutually interactive one for protection and for service of one another.

Bishops, of course had emerged as the top people in the church, at least in terms of churchly authority. These were supposed to be the successors of Christ's apostles. One was made a bishop through the sacrament of holy orders and according to canon law, three other bishops had to be present to place their hand on your head and to receive the Holy Spirit when you were ordained. In fact, they had very carefully prescribed rules for ordinations of bishops and, in fact, even prayers that were established to be read at the times of ordinations for bishops.

Only bishops could confer orders on priests. The area of a bishops jurisdiction was called a dioceses, a see often times when it was in a city where a bishop lived. Only the pope, now with the emerging power of the central authority of Rome and the bishop of Rome, only that figure could create a see; that is, an episcopal jurisdiction. Bishops were responsible for everything that went on in those jurisdictions—the buildings that took place, the maintenance of order and discipline in the parishes, they settled matters which were beyond the priest competent, they held a synod at least once a year and in some areas many more times. All parish priests were required to attend those gatherings. The bishop was also responsible for maintaining a court for diocese and litigation. Disputes of religious matters came under church law and were held and heard in these courts called Bishop's Courts. Of course, there was a possible appeal to Rome of the decisions of these courts, but by and large they stood. To assist in the above, the bishops had diocesan functionaries—archdeacons, usually priests and others, who presided sometimes in their place at the Bishop's Courts and they assisted the bishops in their tasks.

You can see that the bishop is a very powerful and potentially influential figure within this period of history. Bishops reported to their superiors which were often called archbishops. A bishop whose see was in an important city often held archdiocesan synods in which all bishops of the area were invited, and in fact most of them attended. All bishops and archbishops were required to visit Rome, at least from the eleventh century on, on a regular basis. The bishops given all of those various tasks almost inevitably became increasingly secular. Their concern was so much over temporal matters, over buildings and budgets and the like. They held oftentimes political powers. They could control many of the
church offices and preferments. Because of this, many of them were drawn into increasingly secular styles, and, in fact, this is going to create great problems by the late Middle Ages and, in fact, is one of the abuses that the Reformers continually point to when they want a cleaning up of the church in its life.

How were these bishops selected? Well the ancient custom was that they were elected by the clergy and the people by acclamation, the candidates actually chosen by the clergy. In practice, temporal princes often presented their candidates and the clergy and the people were expected to accept them, especially in areas where the feudal lord was particularly strong, so that you can see another secularization process taking place here. And, in fact, we find increasing numbers of nobles or noble sons among the clergy, those who are put up by the temporal princes and the people simply acquiesced. Obviously this is going to create some problems and, in fact, it does as the church is filled increasingly with leadership that is less and less qualified and that is more and more secular.

At the head of all of this great pyramid of clergy activity is the bishop of Rome, who increasingly over the Middle Ages is recognized as the authority within the church within the West. Now we’ll pick up this story a little bit later as well when we talk about the tensions between the East and the West and the channels of authority between those two wings of the church.

J. N. D. Kelly, for those of you who may be interested in exploring more about that group of bishops in Rome or popes, has recently come out with an interesting dictionary of popes, which makes for very fascinating reading. It’s the *Oxford Dictionary of Popes* put out by Oxford Press, of course, in 1986, and it actually talks about every one of the popes in short biographical sketches, and those of you who have a special interest in that area may want to pick that book up.

The pope, of course, had a curia, as it was called, to assist in governing the church. This was a court. The curia was composed of cardinals. These were principle bishops, these were the folk who by 1059 and following were the ones designated to elect the pope. I think most of us are fairly familiar with that process today. They were appointed by the pope. In the thirteenth century, there were some fifty-two of these. In 1179, cardinals were organized into a legal corporation called a *college*. All of these at that early stage resided in Rome. It’s only in more recent times that they
have lived abroad, as is true today. Cardinals increasingly were given clerks, secretaries, and others to help them, so that we have this enormous superstructure emerging around the papal office in Rome to oversee both the temporal and spiritual affairs of the church.

Now when the pope meets the cardinals, it’s called a consistory. Pope Innocent, for example, held consistories some two to three times every week. More recent times, they’ve been held far less often. We also have the curia divided into departments as it becomes more and more bureaucratic. You have the papal chancery taken care of all of the correspondence and the papal camera, the financial bureau, and the papal courts dealing with legal matters, and you could go on and on as you look at this growing structure that emerges in Rome and oversees Medieval Christendom. When the pope called a general council, both bishops and abbots were expected to attend. Some government leaders came as well. This was kind of like a Western European assembly and you have an example of that in the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 called by Innocent IV in which 412 bishops were present, some 800 abbots and priors and a number of lay delegates. They met over a period of three weeks wrestling with and struggling with elements about the faith and its proper definition.

What we see then in the Middle Ages just structurally is that there is a decentralization, that the basic political power tends to become organized over the feudal structure in individual localities or regions. Those are overseen by feudal lords with special relationships of privilege and responsibility with the serfs under their authority and control. The parish priest and the parish itself establishes itself within that structure, and sometimes is even governed or controlled by it. Theoretically though, the parish priest is responsible to the bishop and the bishop to the archbishop, and ultimately the archbishop to the senior bishop, the pope centered in Rome, a center which has become increasingly bureaucratized—some would say even top heavy with administrative officials.

Now that is the basic structure that we need to understand is a foundation to make sense out of many of the things that we’ll be looking at in subsequent lectures, because those grow out of a lot of the immediate conditions of this kind of decentralized structure, which draws clearly upon the old Roman and Greek patterns, upon these new Germanic influence of the so-called Barbarians, and obviously also upon the great impact of the
Judeo-Christian tradition.

Now the gatherings that made most impact upon the life of the church in terms of its governess and of its theology were the great ecumenical councils, and I suggested to you earlier that across history twenty-one of these ecumenical councils have been called and are recognized by the Roman Catholic Church. The first seven of those are recognized by the Eastern Church, and we’ll talk more about that later. The first four of those that we looked at more specifically earlier on were representative of thought and theology for Protestants, Catholics, and Orthodox. That’s why we took special pains to look at the theology around the Trinity and Christology that emerged out of those gatherings.

One of the elements that we’ve not had a chance to talk about and that I need to mention so that we’ll not lose that in the next is that these ecumenical councils not only produced theological statements, such as the Nicene Creed and the Formula of Chalcedon, but they also produced in almost every case a series of canons. Now canons is a terribly imposing sounding word, but it means simply law of the church; and if you look at these, you find that they are dealing with very practical, pastoral issues. Let me suggest to you if you have an interest in this that you turn once again to the Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, the second series, that wonderful collection which has been republished by William Eerdman’s Publishing Company. This is Volume 14 of that second series which actually gives you in one volume all of the basic documents and commentaries on the documents relating to the first seven ecumenical councils. It is an enormously rich and important resource, and it’s one that some of you may even want to try to purchase. Certainly you’ll find it quite easily in the library.

If you turn in that volume, or just listen in with me as I read, to page 267 and following, you have an example of a series of canons, some thirty of them, that were produced in 451 as a part of the Council of Chalcedon. Now the theological formula which defined Orthodoxy emerged out of Chalcedon and has been enormously important to all of us in the church since that time and, in fact, is well-known to most of us, but very few of us would be familiar with these canons. Let me just mention a few of them to give you a flavor of the kinds of things that they were dealing with.

In Canon 2 at Chalcedon, for example, they’ve evidently run into the problem of people buying ecclesiastical office. This is the old
issue of simony that I mentioned in an earlier lecture and that continues right through the history of the church, and in Canon Two of Chalcedon, they deal with this by saying unambiguously that “no one can be allowed to buy an ecclesiastical office period,” and it gives a clear definition of what that means and it talks a bit about the scandal which has been created by the fact that people have indeed bought church offices.

Canon 3 deals with the problem of clergy trying to earn money outside of their normal payments as priests. They aren’t supposed to moonlight and Canon 3 eliminates the possibility of clergy moonlighting. Canon 4 affirms the principle that monks and monasteries are subject to the bishops in those areas. Now you will remember some of the struggles that have gone on between authorities when you have a Monastic structure that is larger in some cases than the normal structures of the church in that area, and it would be easy for the abbot or the archimandrite, the leader of those structures, to control the church as whole, but this Canon 4 of Chalcedon makes very clear again that authority in the church is to be given to the bishops. These are the secular clergy, so called, as opposed to the regular clergy. The regular clergy are those who are under a rule, basically the Monastic vote; secular clergy are not secularized, they are simply the ones who oversee the normal functioning of church life.

Canon 6—just to go through and pick up a few more of these—deals with the problem of ordination and it prohibits people from being ordained to ministry who don’t have a calling to a particular charge or parish setting. Canon 7 deals with clergy who want to leave their ministries for secular service. It says you can’t do and there are some real scriptures laid down against that. Canon 8 deals with clergy being subject to their local bishops, and you can hear kind of echoes in the background of all of the problems that probably created these canons. Canon 9 deals with court life and people who have legal problems now are often going to the secular courts, and this canon says those who are in the clergy must go to the ecclesiastical courts and have their case heard there.

Canon 12 says you can’t gerrymander, to use a modern term. Bishops can’t divide up territory so that they can gain more power. These are to be set up for spiritual ministry purposes, not for personal gain to earn more income. Canon 13 deals with traveling clergy and how to deal with them. Canon 14 allows readers and singers to get married. Canon 15 says that deaconesses must be at least forty years of age or older. Evidently they were having
some problems with younger ones. Canon 16 confirms that monks cannot get married. Canon 18 deals with conspiracies against the bishop. Canon 19 says that the synod is to meet at least twice a year. Canon 20 indicates that the clergy are not to move, that once they are in place in ministry, they are to stay there forever. Canon 23 deals with troublemakers that have come to Constantine and it actually kicks them out of town. You can go right through these canons and others to indicate some of the practical issues that they’re dealing with.

So then as we look at this period of history, we find it not only rich and diverse, but built upon this kind of substructure of feudal life of decentralized government, but now with growing emerging patterns that are recognizable in the life of the church, and we’ll take a look at some of those as we move forward.